## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS HOUSTON DIVISION

Tamara Johnson, : Civil Action No.: 4:16-cv-2112

Plaintiff,

v.

Conn Appliances, Inc.,

COMPLAINT

JURY

Defendant.

For this Complaint, Plaintiff, Tamara Johnson, by undersigned counsel, states as follows:

### **JURISDICTION**

- 1. This action arises out of Defendant's repeated violations of the Telephone Consumer Protection Act 47 U.S.C. § 227, et seq. (the "TCPA").
- 2. Venue is proper in this District pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b), in that Defendant transacts business in this District and a substantial portion of the acts giving rise to this action occurred in this District.

#### **PARTIES**

- 3. Plaintiff, Tamara Johnson ("Plaintiff"), is an adult individual residing in Round Rock, Texas, and is a "person" as defined by 47 U.S.C. § 153(39).
- 4. Defendant, Conn Appliances, Inc. ("Conn"), is a Texas business entity with an address of 4055 Technology Forest Boulevard, Suite 210, The Woodlands, Texas 77381-2008, and is a "person" as defined by 47 U.S.C. § 153(39).

#### **FACTS**

- 5. Within the last year, Conn began placing calls to Plaintiff's cellular telephone, number 512-xxx-9480, using an automatic telephone dialing system ("ATDS") and/or using an artificial or prerecorded voice.
- 6. When Plaintiff answered calls from Conn, she heard a prerecorded message and had to wait on the line to be connected to the next available representative.
- 7. On or about February 29 and March 2, 2016, Plaintiff spoke with representatives and requested that all calls to her cease.
- 8. Nevertheless, Conn continued to place automated calls to Plaintiff's cellular telephone number.

# COUNT I VIOLATIONS OF THE TCPA – 47 U.S.C. § 227, et. seq.

- 9. Plaintiff incorporates by reference all of the above paragraphs of this Complaint as though fully stated herein.
- 10. At all times mentioned herein, Defendant called Plaintiff's cellular telephone number using an ATDS or predictive dialer and/or using an artificial or prerecorded voice.
- 11. In expanding on the prohibitions of the TCPA, the Federal Communications

  Commission ("FCC") defines a predictive dialer as "a dialing system that automatically dials

  consumers' telephone numbers in a manner that "predicts" the time when a consumer will

  answer the phone and a [representative] will be available to take the call..."2003 TCPA Order,

  18 FCC 36 Rcd 14022. The FCC explains that if a representative is not "free to take a call that

  has been placed by a predictive dialer, the consumer answers the phone only to hear 'dead air' or

  a dial tone, causing frustration." *Id.* In addition, the TCPA places prohibitions on companies that

  "abandon" calls by setting "the predictive dialers to ring for a very short period of time before

disconnecting the call; in such cases, the predictive dialer does not record the call as having been abandoned." *Id*.

- 12. Defendant's telephone system(s) have some earmarks of a predictive dialer.
- 13. When Plaintiff answered calls from Defendant, she heard a prerecorded message before Defendant's telephone system would connect her to the next available representative.
- 14. Defendant's predictive dialers have the capacity to store or produce telephone numbers to be called, using a random or sequential number generator.
- 15. Defendant placed automated calls to Plaintiff's cellular telephone number despite knowing that it lacked consent to do so. As such, each call placed to Plaintiff was made in knowing and/or willful violation of the TCPA, and subject to treble damages pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3)(C).
- 16. The telephone number called by Defendant was assigned to a cellular telephone service for which Plaintiff incurs charges pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(1).
- 17. Plaintiff was annoyed, harassed and inconvenienced by Defendant's continued calls.
- 18. The calls from Defendant to Plaintiff were not placed for "emergency purposes" as defined by 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(1)(A)(i).
- 19. Plaintiff is entitled to an award of \$500.00 in statutory damages for each call in violation of the TCPA pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3)(B).
- 20. As a result of each call made in knowing and/or willful violation of the TCPA, Plaintiff is entitled to an award of treble damages in an amount up to \$1,500.00 pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3)(B) and 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3)(C).

#### **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

**WHEREFORE**, Plaintiff prays that judgment be entered against Defendant:

- A. Statutory damages of \$500.00 for each violation determined to be negligent pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3)(B);
- B. Treble damages for each violation determined to be willful and/or knowing pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3)(C); and
- C. Such other and further relief as may be just and proper.

#### TRIAL BY JURY DEMANDED ON ALL COUNTS

Dated: July 15, 2016

Respectfully submitted,

By: /s/ Jenny DeFrancisco

Jenny DeFrancisco, Esq. CT Bar No.: 432383 LEMBERG LAW LLC A Connecticut Law Firm 43 Danbury Road, 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor Wilton, CT 06897

Telephone: (203) 653-2250 Facsimile: (203) 653-3424